

**AGENDA**  
**Alaska TRCC Meeting**

March 25, 2009

AST Conference Room, 5700 Tudor Rd.

1:30 pm – 4:30 pm

Tele conf # 1-800-315-6338, meet me code 5682

**Attendees:**

- Ulf Petersen, CVE/DOT&PF
- Hans Brinke, AST/DPS
- Kat Peterson, AST/DPS
- Joe Darnell, ASAP
- Carl Gonder, DOT&PF
- Ron Martindale, DOT&PF
- Diane Schenker, Courts
- Shelly Mellott, DMV
- Joanna Bradford, AHSO/DOT&PF

**On phone:**

- Dave Brower
- John Lucking
- Cindy Cashen

**I. Internal Committee Business**

- a. Approval of meeting notes from Feb. 11 meeting (Hans)
- **\*\*\*The minutes from the February 11, 2009 meeting are approved.**

**II. Updates on Action Items from Previous Meetings (Hans)**

- a. Tony Piper's paperwork
  - Joe – We are still waiting on the appropriate signatures.
- b. Discuss the alcohol assessments requirements (address later in meeting)
- c. Cindy will follow up with Tim Bundy about replacing Shelley Owens
  - Hans – Hans will send Tim the paperwork, and Tim will get this paperwork to Joanna
- d. Cindy will send out an electronic version of the Alcohol Assessment, and it will be placed on the AHSO web page
  - This has been completed
- e. Cindy will check to see if the Traffic Records Assessment is on the AHSO web site, and have it put there if it is not
  - This has been completed

- f. Ron, Ulf, Kat, Dave Brower, and Chief Lucking will form a subcommittee to look at MMUCC compliance and the 12-200 training materials
  - Ron - we have held two meetings. We have discussed the needs and asked for the different agencies to bring us the top issues that need to be resolved with the 12-200. The next step is for Kat and Ron to look at the grant and make modifications. The next meeting will be on April 15 and we will look at an expanded model of the training manual.
  - Carl - NHTSA has a training site on the web with definitions
  - Ron – we’ve been inviting many different agencies to be involved.
  - Diane – there is a national standard form, with the idea that all government agencies will need to go to this xml standard. When the group looks at the form, it might be easier to look at the national standards and incorporate this into the form.
- g. Cindy will talk to Jack Stickel about the availability of data on the Highway Data Office’s web site
  - Carl – we have all the 2007 data in the database now. We are halfway through the data scrubbing. It will be done by the first of April. Then another month to get it into web form. But for other users, the first week of April. Can’t speak for dataport.
  - Cindy – Jack has made this a priority and has pulled staff off other projects to do this. Jack is hopeful that this will get on there soon.
- h. Contact Darrell Davis regarding E911
  - Table this to another meeting
- i. Hans will update the status of the Interagency MOA on crash data sharing
  - Hans - Recommend we table this issue.
  - Carl – we have an old existing agreement. I am operating under this old agreement.

### **III. Other Short Business? (Hans)**

- a. Chief Lucking’s presentation
  - Hans – Table this to another meeting
- b. AHSO Grant funding Cycle
  - Refer to VI, 2 below

### **IV. CSG Update**

- a. Update on last CSG meeting (Ulf)
  - Ulf – The CSG met on February 25<sup>th</sup>, with 13 people attending, 3 of those on teleconference. They adopted the same format as with the ATRCC. They had 10

action items. They were all completed but one. This is the one where Jeff Ottesen was going to report on the transition plan. DOT has experienced people who will retire, and we need a transition plan. This has been on the “to do” list since September, but hasn’t been completed yet. It will carry forward to the next CSG meeting. The committee has not forgotten about the action item. Other agencies feel they have a similar problem. Jack Stickel will go to the CSG with a presentation about this. The meetings are scheduled on an as-needed basis. About once every quarter. Perhaps another meeting in late May. Depends on any issues from these other meetings. They reviewed the third draft from their charter. Ulf will revise this and send it out for final review.

- Diane and Kat did a minor offense central repository presentation. There was a long discussion about this. The resolution:

*The CSG will review this issue at the next meeting; specifically would such a repository be beneficial to the state, and if so then CSG directs the ATRCC to form a subcommittee to determine which information needs to be captured (common data elements and definition) and provide direction based upon the questions that ATRCC brought up on the slide, and also directs the TraCS Steering Committee to determine and recommend whether or not TraCS 10 will be beneficial to this effort.*

- Carl – this project was not a TraCS project, it included data from other sources.
- Ulf – but only three groups can send issues up to the CSG, so it was included as TraCS. CMV would like to have all courts throughout AK to go electric and completely abandon paper versions.
- Kat – there is a section of the law that requires DPS to have copies of all citations.
- Diane – whatever we can do to get rid of the hand written paper citations, we should do.
- Ulf – the advantage of Kat being able to dial in and have access to the CMV citations should be a model for the rest of us.

**b. CSG Action Items**

- None

**V. Review of Traffic Records and Alcohol Assessments**

- Cindy what needs to be done with the traffic records is increase membership to included non-state membership, native members, military, etc.
- Diane – how is this related to traffic records?
- Ulf – they recommended that we include data users
- Ron – we have tried to get others, like the AIPC

- Diane – in terms of non-government agency members it is a good idea, but we need the TR coordinator to create a basic structure. We should defer this until we have the TR coordinator.
- Hans – we can address this later in November
- \*\*\***Diane moves** that this recommendation be deferred on expanding membership until we have a TR coordinator
- \*\*\***Carl seconds** the motion
- \*\*\***Question:** to defer expansion of membership until we have a Traffic Records coordinator on board
- \*\*\***All in favor, no opposed, motion carries**
- Cindy – there are other recommendations, but this was their only highlighted one. This was their major recommendation
- Hans - and the traffic records assessment? Do we need to revisit this?
- The group decides no

## VI. ATRCC Strategic plan

Hans – We have a list of items to accomplish in the strategic plan:

### “IV. Other Traffic Records Project”

1. Develop an Executive oversight committee:
  - Accomplished.
  - They are still finalizing the charter but they are going forward. This item is completed
2. Create and staff a Traffic Records Coordinator position –
  - Hans - where will the position be housed? There are funding issues. That is where we left it last time.
  - Carl – we all agreed that there is a need for it. We wrote a job description. The CSG sent it back down to us with the major question “find the funding”. Where to get the money.
  - Hans – just the funding issue. Potential 408 funding
  - Cindy – had talked about this with Ulf a month ago. This would be a good use of traffic records funding. We are coming across several projects like TraCS and the 12-200, with many projects involving many agencies, and a TR Coordinator would be the person to make this happen. If this position is funded through AHSO it would be hard to get because it would have to go through OMB. But if the ATRCC makes this item a priority, we will follow through and go through the steps to get this approved.
  - Ulf – what if we go through the process and we still get a no?
  - Cindy - this is probably what will happen. DOT is being scrutinized for any new position
  - Ulf - what if we move to allocate a certain amount in 408 funding and put it out as an RFP for a contractor. If we could agree today to allocate 408 funding to hire a contractor

- Carl – we have the 408 funding for this FFY up to Oct, and by the time we do an RFP and get it awarded, and then we are at the end of the FFY. If we put out an RFP, it would have to span multiple years, and have a funding commitment. A funding commitment for FFY2010 and reflect that in the RFP.
- Diane – we should ask for 5 years.
- Carl – bare minimum or we are wasting our time
- Ulf – there is no reason why we can't write the RFP and post it. We could have a contract on board in November.
- Carl – so not this FFY09, but FFY10
- Ulf – this year has been committed. So we should do it for next FFY.
- Hans – is there 408 funding available for this year?
- Cindy – we should concentrate on ffy10
- Diane – so the position would be in AHSO? And receive support there?
- Cindy – the position would work directly with Cindy. Cindy would have to write up the position description
- Diane – would this person take direction from the ATRCC, even though they would be working directly for AHSO?
- Cindy – The direction would come from the ATRCC. I would only administer the funds, and the communication, contacts, and technical difficulties
- Diane – do any other jurisdictions hire contractors? Is there a firm out there who has done this? We don't want someone who has never done this before
- Ulf – I'm not aware of anyone who has ever used contractors. My director has included this position in this grant proposal for the first year. But I looked for research from other states to see what they are doing. In Indiana, they hired a TR Coordinator, and then reported that *perhaps no other action has had such an impact as hiring a TR Coordinator*. It had a tremendous impact. It is now two years after our assessment, and we still need someone. We can't get a state person now, so a contractor could start sooner rather than later.
- Carl – if Ulf gets this grant from FMCSA, would you go get a contractor?
- Ulf – my director would choose to work with AHSO to get this position
- Diane – do we know if there is any move afoot in the state procurement office to prevent this? People going around them with a contractor? Any problems?
- Cindy – I don't foresee a problem. DOT puts out RFPs for similar projects.
- Ulf – how much would an appropriate amount be from the 408 funds?
- Diane – when looking over all the duties that this person has to do, there is a huge scope of duties. Are we thinking someone in state, or outside of state?
- Carl – when you put out an RFP, you get people from all over the country. But in-state people would have preference, in the form of extra points.
- Diane – are you looking for someone who has done these duties before? We know we may mostly have out-of-state bidders. We could say they have to have experience with Alaska databases and records. Someone who knows what we have here. Or is it more important that we have someone who knows the large scale and strategic planning history?

- Carl – if we don't do that, we could have an RFP that will limit the responses to only certain companies outside the state. This discussion is crucial
- Diane – we should ask NHTSA if they have any success or horror stories when planning this. It would be worth checking this
- Ulf – but with the money, we have to make a commitment soon.
- Kat – we have the money in the strategic plan,
- Ulf – page 17 on the strategic plan where we listed the cost between \$125,000 and \$175,000. If you want to move on this, we could
- Cindy – before we move, ATRCC needs to consider this a priority
- Ulf – if you move this now, the committee would vote on whether that will be part of the ranking process
- **\*\*\*Diane moves** that this becomes the number one ranking priority
- **\*\*\*Cindy seconds**
- Carl – to make sure we don't get into any trouble, when we get to the ranking process, we need an actual AHSO grant proposal
- **\*\*\*Diane moves** that we vote that this is our number one priority regardless of where the funding comes from
- **\*\*\*Cindy seconds**
- Carl - would like to amend to include that we actually do the paperwork and put it through the normal process. So it's clear we understand that we need to go through the process just like every other grant.
- Cindy – we don't write grants to ourselves
- Ulf – in our strategic plan, on page 3 and 4 we have a process of how we read and score each proposal. We have to review this with all the other proposals
- Cindy – the strategic plan already contains the info that we need to use to prioritize.
- Ulf – the strategic plan has a specific procedure and we have to use this process to prioritize for 408 funding
- Cindy – I won't write a grant to myself, but use the language that is already in the strategic plan
- Ulf – but bring this to the ATRCC meeting to put a vote on, we have to go by the procedure that's in the strategic plan. Based on the project scoring methodology
- Diane – but this isn't a project. This is overhead. We need someone to coordinate everything. It isn't a project. Not trying to undercut the process, but we have in the strategic plan that the TR Coordinator needs to do *everything*. So we won't get anything done until we hire this person. This is not like a project proposal.
- Ulf – but it is listed as a project in the traffic records strategic plan
- Cindy – if you want me to submit a grant, I will
- Ulf – the strategic plan says that we use this methodology as laid out in the plan, so we can explain to the feds why we made this a priority
- Ron – what if we de-list this as a "project" and just use this to hire an employee
- Carl – this is a process issue. We have to follow the process that we drew up. Regardless of whatever you call this, you are still allocating these funds, and if we want to avoid problems of an audit later, we need to follow this process

- Hans – if we are going to contract or hire a Traffic Records employee, do we have to write a grant for this person? Or can Cindy just hire this person, being the administrator of the funds.
- Cindy – we should follow the process, but I'm not going to write a new grant when we have it in the strategic plan already. This document would be submitted for FFY10.
- Hans – so literally you would just take it all and put it into a grant application
- Ron – it's not a grant but it is treated like one.
- Hans – do we have to make it a grant to get the money?
- Cindy – we need a document that provides us with sufficient info to prioritize it. We already have all the info. I would just use that
- Hans – we should follow the procedures and rank it. But how do we get this into the process? Does it have to be in a proposal, or a formal grant write-up? What do we have to provide?
- Cindy – wants to follow the process
- Kat – Cindy will produce the document that follows the same process as a grant, even though it's not a grant.
- Ulf – what date should we agree on as a committee by which people submit projects?
- Kat – only for new projects,
- Cindy – 408 June 15 is the first date that we evaluate proposals. May 20<sup>th</sup> perhaps.
- Hans – we have to have the final prioritization done by the 20<sup>th</sup>.
- Carl – short history, last year, we constructed the methodology then set the deadline, then sent the projects ahead of the meeting so we could read them first, then at the next meeting we allowed people to do a short presentation on their proposals, then we voted
- Diane – is this a strategic plan on how to use 408 grant funds, or a plan on how to improve traffic records? There might be things that might not have anything to do with funding. This committee needs to put as its priority a TR coordinator, and then list our priorities for the overall strategy for traffic records; separate from just handing out money. Keep in mind that funding and projects are two separate issues. We should prioritize in another way; not just how we use 408 grant funds
- Carl – the strategic plan is required for all traffic records; not just the grant funds
- Diane – in a future meeting we should rank all of our goals, not just the grant ones. We should come up with a hierarchy.
- Hans – that's what I hope we can start doing now. We need the TR coordinator as a priority. We agree that it needs to be taken care of. Deciding where the money will be spent is part of what we do too. Helping the AHSO spend the money
- Ron – last year it depended on who put together a grant application. One of the prioritizing factors was if the grant supported parts of the traffic records recommendations. The committee got to vote on how to prioritize the projects. People came forward who fit into the committee's priorities.

- Ulf – we have to show how the state of AK intends to spend the 408 money. We should then take the second step and go through and prioritize and figure out what we want. In this second generation of this, we should start looking a bit closer at them and start putting a prioritization together.
- Carl – last year in order to develop a strategic plan, we had to have a starting point. We used the traffic records assessment. This is not the way to do a strategic plan. So if we really want to do the strategic plan correctly, we need to start much earlier. If we want to start this right we should start in November with a subcommittee.
- Ron – we don't have time. So now we need to just move forward
- Carl – I mean for down the road. We should do it a bit more correctly with a long range focus.
- Diane – Couldn't we just assign them a priority? High, med, low? As opposed to a fancy grid. This would be better than not ranking at all.
- Hans – just the existing projects not new ones, but then we need a drop dead date for all new ones
- Ulf – so May 20<sup>th</sup> is the date?
- Ron – if it's an existing project, do we have to do an entirely new grant?
- Hans – my grant request will be different, so it will be more enforcement based
- Ron – if it's unchanged, do we have to start over?
- Hans – if it's an existing multi-year grant, we don't need to reapply
- Ulf – anyone who wants to submit proposals, May 20<sup>th</sup>
- Kat – but if there is a grant that exists already, it doesn't need to be redone completely for more money for the next year.
- Hans – BHP is not in the strategic plan
- Cindy – the money didn't come from traffic records. BHP doesn't use 408 funding.
- Hans – who is responsible for writing the strategic plan for this year?
- Cindy – we could probably just update last years
- Ulf – the dead projects will need to be deleted and then we'll add new projects. This is a bit more intense than just updating. For every project we need to contact the project manager, and work on it with them
- Cindy – me and Joanna
- Hans – April 15<sup>th</sup> solicit any new projects. Submissions need to be in, and then we have a meeting to review on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April.
- Cindy - this includes all of grants, new and updating grants
- Hans – we can meet again on the April 29<sup>th</sup>, May 6<sup>th</sup> have the draft plan, then send out to committee members, by the 13<sup>th</sup>, then back to Cindy by May 20<sup>th</sup>
- Ulf – May 20<sup>th</sup> would be a good time to vote on the strategic plan
- Diane – would this be the time to prioritize all the projects and plans?
- Ulf - this would be a good topic for the next meeting on April 15<sup>th</sup>.
- Hans – we need to identify and prioritize what our goals are.
- Diane – the goals and objectives come first, and then come up with project goals that address our goals and objectives. We should keep these separate
- Hans – a review and prioritization on what day?



- Ulf – **perhaps the doodle calendar for the review meeting**
  - Ron – but all new proposals need to be to us by the next meeting April 15<sup>th</sup>.
  - Hans – we will use high, med, low to rank these.
  - **\*\*\*The group agrees that this is high priority**
3. Revise AS 28.35.080 law enforcement has the primary responsibility for crash investigation
    - Hans - this is closed
    - **\*\*\*Ulf motions** to deleted this from the strategic plan,
    - **\*\*\*Diane seconds, but amends** to say “reject” instead of “delete”
    - **\*\*\*All in favor, no opposed, motion carries**
  4. Explore and implement electronic crash data collection and data transfer procedures
    - complete
  5. Identify a strategy for an inventory of the core traffic records system –
    - Carl – after discussion we decided that the TR Coordinator will address this.
    - **\*\*\*The group decides** this is low priority.
  6. Create a traffic safety resource guide:
    - **\*\*\*Diane moves** that this carries forward but be included in the duties of the TR Coordinator.
    - **\*\*\*Ulf seconds**
    - **\*\*\*All in favor, no opposed. Motion carries**
    - **\*\*\*This item is deferred** until the hiring of a TR Coordinator
    - **\*\*\*Group decides** this is low priority
  7. Produce, analyze and report on injury surveillance data annually
    - Carl – this is related to the CODES project. This project did receive funding from the AHSO. Shelley Owens retired and is replaced by Alice Rarig. Who is in the process of forming a subcommittee and is in the process of trying to get to know all the players and get this project started.
    - Kat – April 9<sup>th</sup> is the first meeting on this in Juneau
    - Hans – will she have to reapply if she doesn’t use all the funding this year?
    - Diane - as for our strategic plan, **we are updating that Alice is replacing Shelley.**
    - Ulf – last year we just sent out a request to update the progress of the project. **We will send out a request for an update from HSS**
    - Cindy – she did provide an update in TRIPPRS
    - Hans – what is the financial update
    - Cindy – this should be low priority
    - Ulf – object to assigning this as a low priority since the project manager isn’t here
    - Cindy – disagree, as the administrator I can say they have made significant progress on this grant. I would keep this a low priority
    - Diane – preface this as “low is not bad”
    - Carl – we should define “low”, “med”, and “high”. Unless we define what low is, why would we put money towards something as low priority?

- Diane – but saying it is low doesn't mean we won't support it. We are ranking the strategic plan, not the money. There are things in here that don't cost anything. We are not ranking the money; we are just ranking our priorities.
  - Carl – we have discussed this. The issue is that when we are ranking these it has nothing to do with the funding priorities. These are our goals and objectives for the long term. Just our priorities as far as high med low.
  - Ulf – we should wait until we have the project manager here
  - **\*\*\*Ulf moves** that for the purpose of methodology to **defer the decision** on high med low until we hear from the project manager to defend the project
  - Carl – just on this list of 26, we would defer decision on these projects until we have the stakeholder
  - **\*\*\*Carl seconds**
  - Ron – anything that doesn't have a project manager we can still rank though
  - Carl – we are looking forward to the long term
  - Ron – so if that person isn't here
  - Ulf - or if they have a proxy here. So if they aren't here they can't defend their project.
  - Dave – but if a project manager finds out that their project was ranked as low, it doesn't mean that they don't keep working on it
  - Hans – so we can have a high med low and *defer*
  - **\*\*\*Vote on motion: to defer the ranking of a project, if the project manager is not available**
  - **\*\*\*All in favor, no opposed, motion carries**
  - **\*\*\*This project is deferred**
8. Design and implement an EMS data system (NEMSIS)
    - Whoever replaces Shelley will work on this.
    - **\*\*\*Group decides to defer this project ranking**
  9. Continue implementation of CVARS and MAJIC projects –
    - Diane – MAJIC isn't a project, not really. It is an interagency group. We should amend this objective to continue CVARS, but not MAJIC.
    - Ulf – CVARS in this plan was completed, but a new CVARS has been put in its place
    - Carl – the intent was to have these committees coordinating with each other. The concept was to have coordination. But now we have a TraCS steering committee.
    - Diane – and this concept has been adequately addressed by the different committees, TraCS, CSG, etc.
    - Ron - so this project is complete
    - **\*\*\*Diane – we should just mark it complete**
    - **\*\*\*Carl seconds**
    - **\*\*\*Group decides it is complete**
  10. Revise the 12-200 crash form
    - Ron – we need to defer this until MMUCC 3
    - Diane – it is low priority then

- Ulf - delete it completely. There is no support among the stakeholders. And this committee decided to start making a list of the changes to make when it's time to change the form.
- Carl – this committee voted to drop the project
- Ulf – we should delete it
- Diane – but we still need to keep it on the list.
- Kat – at some point it will go from low to high when the feds say to change it
- Diane – they need to see that it is still in the strategic plan, which justifies still working on it.
- Diane – we should just make it low priority
- Kat – we need to update it to fix the wording
- Ulf – we should put it at low priority, but not delete it from the plan
- Diane – then we can defer it for a specific reason
- Ulf – my name should come out. We should update it.
- **\*\*\*Group decides this is low priority**
- **\*\*\*Hans - The project manager updates from Ulf Petersen to Kat Peterson**
- **\*\*\*No objections**

11. Include MPOs and local jurisdiction in the ATRCC

- “Municipal planning organizations”
- Carl – the intent of the committee for this project at the time was that the committee had underrepresentation from local members. We do have someone from the municipality of anchorage, Kim Carpenter, and also the Police Chief of Soldotna, Chief Lucking
- Carl - we should drop the wording MPO, and just say that we are including municipal members
- Hans – so it is completed then?
- **\*\*\*Group decides this item is complete**

12. Mandate the use of a uniform traffic citation form

- Kat – it is in process
- Diane – this is a very high priority
- **\*\*\*Group decides this is high**

13. Include CDL drivers' histories in all crash records

- Shelly - We are in the process of tracking commercial records. The goal is to make it so it is not a manual process. It is an ongoing thing
- Diane – med priority?
- **\*\*\*Group decides this is med priority**

14. Create a new vehicle database query system (ALVINA)

- Shelly - There is an RFP out right now to pay for this. There has been progress. We are looking at 3-5 years.
- **\*\*\*The group decides this is high priority**

15. Provide system/systems that allow for user-friendly queries

- Ron – the dataport will go public this year, so this is ongoing

- Diane – this is medium
  - **\*\*\*Group decides this is med**
16. Expand the use of the Highway Data Portal
- Ron – this will happen anyway. High for Ron, but for the group maybe a med
  - **\*\*\*Group decides this is high**
17. Improve tracking of minor consuming offenses
- Cindy – this is ongoing, it has improved with the funding we've given them
  - Diane – this should be high
  - Joe – we need to update Tony Piper to the project manager
  - **\*\*\*Group decides this is high priority**
  - Dave – there were two bills on this in the legislature
18. Continue implementation of Fast -Fars
- Joanna - This project is completed, it is just an ongoing operational process
  - Diane – maybe we should just reword this
  - Carl – we should change the title but we should make the reporting of fatalities to FARS a high priority and change the performance measures
  - Ulf – maybe we should take this out,
  - Carl – we need to recognize that what we have now is not necessarily what we'll have next year or the year after. This should really be an ongoing effort
  - Ulf – this means it is operations, and not a project. A project is a temporary endeavor.
  - Carl – just because it is completed doesn't mean that it will be erased.
  - Diane – so we take it out, but reflect that it was successful.
  - Ulf – we can show a revised list of all the completed projects at the end of the plan
  - **\*\*\*The group decides this is a completed project**
19. Make crash reports and traffic convictions to DMV timelier
- **\*\*\*The group decides this as high priority**
20. Electronic filing of TraCS citations
- Ulf – almost completed
  - Diane – this shouldn't just be DOT
  - Ulf – part of this is done
  - Diane – but not completed yet, high
  - **\*\*\*The group decides this is high, but change the manager to Kat Peterson**
21. Trauma registry improvement project
- **\*\*\*Defer this until a representative from public health is here**
22. Demonstrate capabilities of the automatic crash notification systems
- **\*\*\*Completed**
23. NEMSIS compatible Alaskan electronic database for pre-hospital emergency care
- Cindy – this is completed
  - **\*\*\*completed**
24. Develop a crash outcome data evaluation system CODES for Alaska
- Cindy – this is part of the EMS optimization grant - this is completed

- **\*\*\*complete**
- 25. Document digital cell phone signal strength on the main highway corridors of Alaska
  - **\*\*\*complete**
- 26. Document lat/long of crash locations on the main highway corridors of Alaska
  - **\*\*\*complete**

## **“II. FFY 08 Traffic Records Projects”**

1. Alaska crash outcomes pilot project
  - **\*\*\*Defer this project ranking**
2. Mobile data terminal computer purchase
  - Kat – in progress
  - **\*\*\* Group decides this is high priority**
3. Traffic records system single portal pilot project
  - Ron there is an RFP out on this right now, it should be high
  - **\*\*\*The group decides this is high**
4. 12-200 electronic crash data entry protocol and data entry portal project
  - **\*\*\*Defer waiting for the CSG to give guidance on this**
5. 12-200 crash form training project
  - **\*\*\*Group decides this is High**

## **“III. FFY07 Traffic Records Projects”**

1. Uniform table of offense
  - Kat – make this high and put Lance Ahern down as the project manager
  - **\*\*\*Group decides this is high, and change Project manager to Lance Ahern**
2. Alaska State Troopers TraCS pilot project
  - Kat – we are moving to the TraCS 10 format
  - **\*\*\*The group decides this is high, but update the goals and verbiage by project manager**

## **VII. TR Coordinator Position**

- Refer to VI, 2. above

## **VIII. Last Minute Items**

- Ulf – reminder the doodle calendar.

## **IX. Action Items as a Result of this Meeting**

- a. Tony Piper’s paperwork

- b.** Hans will send Tim Bundy the paperwork, and Tim will send it to Joanna once it is signed
- c.** Hans will update the status of the Interagency MOA on crash data sharing
- d.** Chief Lucking's presentation
- e.** Joanna will send out a doodle calendar for the **Review** meeting of projects

**X.      Next Meeting – April 15, 2009, 1:30 – 4:30, AST Conf Room**

**Meeting adjourns at 4:50pm**